



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
HEADQUARTERS 436TH AIRLIFT WING (AMC)

MEMORANDUM FOR 436 CES/CEV

FROM: 436 MSG/CC

SUBJECT: Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)-Construct a Youth Center facility

1. Dover AFB is proposing to construct a multipurpose Youth Center facility. The facility will consist of approximately 32,823 square feet.
2. An environmental assessment, which is attached, was drafted and demonstrates that there are no significant environmental impacts from the proposed action. An environmental assessment was available for public review and comment from 16 May through 29 May 2004. No comments were received.
3. This document was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations of 1978, and Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-7061, *The Environmental Impact Analysis Process*. AFI 32-7061 addresses implementation of the NEPA and directs Air Force officials to consider the environmental consequences of any proposal as part of the decision-making process. This instruction has been recently amended and appears, as amended, in 32 CFR Part 989. It was determined that neither an environmental impact statement nor a formal environmental assessment is necessary. No further environmental documentation is necessary.
4. I have evaluated the attached environmental assessment and find no significant impacts on the quality of the human or natural environment from the proposed action.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "RJ King", is positioned above the name of the signatory.

ROBERT J. KING, Colonel, USAF  
Commander, 436<sup>th</sup> Mission Support Group

Attachments:

1. AF Form 813
2. Environmental Assessment

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE <b>MAY 2004</b>		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-2004 to 00-00-2004</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Environmental Assessment Construction a Youth Center Facility</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>436th Civil Engineer Squadron (CES/CEV),600 Chevron Ave,Dover AFB,DE,19902</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>Same as Report (SAR)</b>	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>22</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

# **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CONSTRUCT A YOUTH CENTER FACILITY**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Dover Air Force Base (DAFB) is located in Kent County, Delaware. The base is situated 3.5 miles southeast of the center of Dover, Delaware, the state capital. The base covers approximately 3,902 acres of land area including annexes, easements, and leased property.

Dover AFB has two active airfields. The north-south airfield at Dover AFB divides the main Base into two primary sections. Open space, recreational areas, and limited amounts of industrial uses are located east of the airfield. The land uses west of the airfield and east of U.S. Route 113 are industrial, airfield operations, administrative, community, medical, and some unaccompanied personnel housing. Eagle Heights Military Family House (MFH), temporary lodging quarters, a golf course, and additional unaccompanied personnel housing are located west of U.S. Route 113 and east of St. Jones River. The surrounding areas consist primarily of cropland and wetlands, with the Saint Jones River running adjacent to the southwestern corner of the base.

### **1.2 PROJECT PURPOSE and NEED**

The proposed project identified in the AF Form 813 would construct a 32,823 square foot building for a multipurpose Youth Center. The site for the entire project is slated for redevelopment. Currently, family dwelling units exist at the proposed site location. The proposed project is needed to alleviate extremely crowded conditions, allow for expansion of other youth programs, and eliminate safety concerns that exist with the current Youth Center, while ensuring the needs of military personnel in the area continue to be met.

## **2.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

### **2.1 NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT**

The National Environmental Policy Act, commonly known as NEPA, is a Federal statute requiring the identification and analysis of potential environmental impacts of proposed Federal actions before those actions are taken. NEPA established the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) that is charged with the development of implementing regulations and ensuring agency compliance with NEPA. CEQ regulations mandate that all Federal agencies use a systematic interdisciplinary approach to environmental planning and the evaluation of actions that may affect the environment.

This process evaluates potential environmental consequences associated with a proposed action and considers alternative courses of action. The intent of NEPA is to protect, restore, or enhance the environment through well-informed Federal decisions.

The process for implementing NEPA is codified in Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500-1508, *Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act*. CEQ regulations specify the following must be accomplished when preparing an environmental assessment (EA):

- Briefly provide evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) or a finding of no significant impact (FONSI)
- Aid in an agency's compliance with NEPA when an EIS is unnecessary
- Facilitate preparation of an EIS when one is necessary

Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 32-70, *Environmental Quality*, states that the U.S. Air Force (USAF) will comply with applicable Federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations, including NEPA. The USAF's implementing regulation for NEPA is *The Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP)*, 32 CFR Part 989, as amended.

## 2.2 INTEGRATION OF OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

To comply with NEPA, the planning and decision-making process for actions proposed by Federal agencies involves a study of other relevant environmental statutes and regulations. The NEPA process, however, does not replace procedural or substantive requirements of other environmental statutes and regulations. It addresses them collectively in the form of an EA or EIS, which enables the decision-maker to have a comprehensive view of major environmental issues and requirements associated with the Proposed Action. According to CEQ regulations, the requirements of NEPA must be integrated "with other planning and environmental review procedures required by law or by agency so that all such procedures run concurrently rather than consecutively."

The EA examines potential effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives on seven resource areas including air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geological resources, hazardous materials and waste, safety, and water resources. Four resource areas that have been omitted from analysis include infrastructure, noise, land use, and socioeconomics and environmental justice. The basis for the omissions is described in section 4.0. The following paragraphs present examples of relevant laws, regulations, and other requirements that are often considered as part of the analysis.



### 2.2.1 Air Quality

The Clean Air Act (CAA) establishes Federal policy to protect and enhance the quality of the nation's air resources to protect human health and the environment. The CAA requires that adequate steps be implemented to control the release of air pollutants and prevent significant deterioration in air quality. The 1990 amendments to the CAA require Federal agencies to determine the conformity of proposed actions with respect to State Implementation Plans (SIPs) for attainment of air quality goals.

### 2.2.2 Biological Resources

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) requires Federal agencies that fund, authorize, or implement actions to avoid jeopardizing the continued existence of federally listed threatened or endangered species, or destroying or adversely affecting their critical habitat. Federal agencies must evaluate the effects of their actions through a set of defined procedures, which can include preparation of a Biological Assessment and formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

EO 11990, Protection of Wetlands, requires that Federal agencies provide leadership and take actions to minimize or avoid the destruction, loss, or degradation of wetlands and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands.

The CWA, under Section 404, contains provisions for protection of wetlands and establishes a permitting process for activities having potential effects in wetland areas. Wetlands, riverine, and open water systems are considered waters of the United States and, as such, fall under the regulatory jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

### 2.2.3 Cultural Resources

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) provides the principal authority used to protect historic properties, establishes the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and defines, in Section 106, the requirements for Federal agencies to consider the effect of an action on properties on or eligible for the NRHP.

Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties (36 CFR 800 [1986]) provides an explicit set of procedures for Federal agencies to meet their obligations under the NHPA, including inventorying of resources and consultation with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

The Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 ensures that Federal agencies protect and preserve archeological resources on Federal or Native American lands and establishes a permitting system to allow legitimate scientific study of such resources.

EO 13007, Indian Sacred Sites, requires that, to the extent practicable, Federal agencies accommodate access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners and avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sacred sites.

EO 13084, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, requires that each Federal agency shall have an effective process to permit elected officials and other representatives of Indian tribal governments to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory policies or matters that uniquely affect their communities.

#### 2.2.4 Safety

Air Force Instruction (AFI) 91-301, *Air Force Occupational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection, and Health (AFOSH) Program*, implements AFI 91-3, *Occupational Safety and Health*, by outlining the AFOSH Program. The purpose of the AFOSH Program is to minimize loss of USAF resources and to protect USAF personnel from occupational deaths, injuries, or illnesses by managing risks. In conjunction with the USAF Mishap Prevention Program (AFI 91-202), these standards ensure all USAF workplaces meet Federal safety and health requirements. This instruction applies to all USAF activities.

#### 2.2.5 Water Resources

The Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1977 (33 United States Code [USC] 1344) and the Water Quality Act of 1987 (33 USC 1251, et seq., as amended) establish Federal policy to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters, and where attainable, to achieve a level of water quality that provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and recreation in and on the water.

Executive Order (EO) 11988, *Floodplain Management*, requires Federal agencies to take action to reduce the risk of flood damage; minimize the impacts of floods on human safety, health, and welfare; and restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains. Federal agencies are directed to consider the proximity of their actions to or within floodplains. Where information is unavailable, agencies are encouraged to delineate the extent of floodplains at their site.

Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) establishes goals for and a mechanism for states to control use and development of their coastal zones. CZMA applies to actions on federal lands only when state's coastal zone is affected. CZMA requires that federal agencies be consistent with enforceable policies of state coastal zone management programs when conducting or supporting activities within or outside the coastal zone that affect land use, water use, or natural resources of the coastal zone.

#### 2.2.6 Infrastructure

Infrastructure consists of the systems and physical structures that enable a population in a given area to sustain itself. Consideration of infrastructure is applicable to a proposed action or alternative where there may be an issue with respect to local capacities (e.g., utilities, transportation networks, energy) to provide the required support.

#### 2.2.7 Noise

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 150, *Airport Noise Compatibility Planning*, provides guidance to measure noise at airports and surrounding areas and determine exposure of individuals to noise that result from the operations of an airport. FAA Part 150 identifies those land uses which are normally compatible with various levels of exposure to noise by individuals. It also provides technical assistance to airport operators, in conjunction with other local, state, and Federal authorities, to prepare and execute appropriate noise compatibility planning and implementation programs (14 CFR 150).

#### 2.2.8 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice

EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, directs Federal agencies to assess the effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations within their region of influence. Agencies are encouraged to include demographic information related to race and income in their analysis of the environmental and economic effects associated with their actions.

### 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

#### 3.1 PROPOSED ACTION

The youth center at DAFB is an extension of the Boys and Girls Club of Delaware and also coordinates programs with the 4-H. A new, 32,823 square foot, masonry on concrete slab facility would be able to provide services that are not currently available due to space restrictions in the old building. Additionally, more administrative space is also necessary to ease staff crowding. The proposed site is within an existing residential area and is near base schools. The site has been slated for redevelopment and plans for a new youth center can be incorporated into the new development plans. The site is also within a reasonable distance from the former youth center to allow utilization of the existing sports fields. The existing facility can remain in operation during the construction phase, allowing the youth center to maintain some continuity in programming during this period. This proposed project is necessary to satisfy current programming needs, which can not be met in the existing Youth Center.

Along with the building which is required to be setback from Lebanon Road approximately 135 feet, two playgrounds, an open space area, sidewalks, and a new parking area would be built, thus the total project area is approximately 261,360 square feet or approximately 6 acres.

### 3.2 ALTERNATIVE ACTION

Alternative actions were initially considered, but were eliminated due to impracticality. Renovating and/or expanding the existing facility (Building 3449) is not practical or feasible because a portion of the building is shifting and sinking, the floor and ceiling are cracked for the full length of the hallway, and one side of the hallway is lower than the other side. All of these issues are safety hazards. In addition, the current youth center is located in a flood plain, making it an undesirable location for any proposed new addition. There are cultural resources near the existing youth center and the State Historic Preservation Office wants a buffer zone created along the river, which would preclude construction on the west side of the youth center. Furthermore, there are Species of State Concern near the current location, and the existing structure was built over a landfill. Another alternative was to use other existing facilities. This is not practical due to the lack of facilities on base that could adequately support programming needs. Therefore, this EA focuses on the proposed action and the no-action alternative.

### 3.3 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The no-action alternative would maintain the status quo. The building would continue to shift and sink, teenagers have access only during limited hours in order to avoid conflicts with the school age programming, and adults, teenagers, and school-age children will continue to share the same restroom facilities. The existing space is insufficient to support current military family demands. The waiting list for school age children will continue to grow due to space limitations. The foundation of the existing building is settling at an alarming rate, and is a potentially dangerous situation for the children.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Section 4.0 describes the environmental and socioeconomic resources and conditions most likely to be affected by the proposed action.

In compliance with NEPA, CEQ guideline, and 32 CFR Part 989, as amended, the description of the affected environment focuses on those resources and conditions potentially subject to impacts. Some environmental resources and conditions that are often analyzed in an EA have been omitted from this analysis. The following details the basis for such exclusions:

- Infrastructure. The proposed action or the alternative action would not involve any activities that would contribute to major changes with respect to local capacities (e.g., utilities, transportation networks, energy) to provide the required support. The existing utilities would be utilized. The traffic patterns would not change in MFH. Accordingly, the detailed examination of the infrastructure has been omitted.
- Noise. Implementation of the proposed action or the alternative action would not involve permanent alterations to aircraft inventories, operations, or missions. No new permanent ground-based heavy equipment operations would be included in the proposed action or the alternative action. No activity included in the proposed action or the alternative action would result in a situation where residences would be impacted by an increase in present ambient noise levels. Furthermore, noise produced by construction activities associated with the proposed action or the alternative action would be temporary and would not significantly affect sensitive receptors. Accordingly, the detailed examination of noise has been omitted.
- Land Use. All activities associated with the proposed action or the alternative action would be consistent with present and foreseeable land use patterns at Dover AFB. Implementation of the proposed action or the alternative action would not alter the existing land use at Dover AFB. The surrounding land is not considered prime farmland. Accordingly, the detailed examination of land use has been omitted.
- Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice. The proposed action or the alternative action would not involve any activities that would contribute to changes in socioeconomic resources. There would be no change in the number of personnel assigned to DAFB, therefore there would be no changes in area population or associated changes in demand for housing and services. Accordingly, the detailed examination of socioeconomics has been omitted.

Environmental Justice addresses the potential for a proposed federal action to cause disproportionate and adverse health effects on minority or low-income populations. Adverse health effects are not expected, therefore minority and low-income population data is not analyzed in this assessment. There would be no environmental justice concerns associated with the proposed action or the alternative action. Accordingly, the detailed examination of environmental justice has been omitted.

#### 4.1 AIR QUALITY

##### Proposed Action

Dover AFB is an area of severe non-attainment for ozone. The priority air pollutants of concern are nitrogen oxides (NOx) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs). No long-term air quality impacts are expected from the proposed action. The proposed action would generate air pollutant emissions as a result of grading, filling, compacting, and paving operations, but these emissions would be temporary and

would not be expected to generate any off-site impacts. Central heating, ventilation, and air conditioning will be fueled by natural gas, thus the air emissions would not impact threshold air requirements. The proposed action would generate VOC emissions as a result of using solvents, paints, thinners, and coatings, but these emissions would be temporary, *de minimis*, and would not be expected to generate any off-site impacts. Therefore, a Clean Air Act amendment section 176(c) conformity determination is not required.

#### No-Action Alternative

Air quality would not be impacted by the no-action alternative.

### 4.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

#### Proposed Action

After reviewing the 1998 Wetland Survey, it was determined that the proposed project will not impact wetlands or the 100-year floodplain. The proposed action will be in a residential area where family dwelling units are currently located. (Figure 1)

According to the Biological/Ecological Inventory, dated 1993, there are no known occurrences of federally listed threatened and endangered animal or plant on Dover AFB. There is one animal that is of State Concern in Military Family Housing (MFH), and it is located in the St. Jones River and will not be impacted. (Figure 2).

There are two plants of State Concern in MFH. One species is located at the Northern boundary of MFH and the other species is located in the Golf Course area. Neither of these species will be impacted by the proposed action. (Figure 3).

#### No-Action Alternative

Rare and endangered species would not be impacted by the no-action alternative.

### 4.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

#### Proposed Action

There are two cultural resources sites in MFH according to the Cultural Resources Management Plan prepared in 2000. One site is on the Northern boundary of MFH and the other site is located west of the proposed project site. (Figure 4). Therefore, the proposed project site will have no impact on associated prehistoric or historic sites.

#### No-Action Alternative

Cultural resources would not be impacted by the no-action alternative.

### 4.4 GEOLOGY

#### Proposed Action

Slopes in the proposed areas are shallow to flat and the proposed action would not cause or create significant changes to the topography of the Dover AFB area.

#### No-Action Alternative

Topography would not be impacted by the no-action alternative.

### 4.5 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/HAZARDOUS WATER

#### Proposed Action

Construction activities associated with the proposed action would require the use of certain hazardous materials such as paints, welding gases, solvents, preservatives, and sealants. It is anticipated that the quantity of products containing hazardous materials used during the construction would be minimal and their use would be of short duration. Contractors would be responsible for the management of hazardous materials, which would be handled in accordance with Federal and state regulations. Therefore, hazardous materials management would not be impacted by the proposed construction activities. Hazardous materials usage will not be increased.

#### No-Action Alternative

Hazardous materials would not be impacted by the no-action alternative.

### 4.6 OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

#### Proposed Action

An asbestos & lead paint sampling will be conducted prior to disturbing any existing structures that would be demolished. Any asbestos or lead based paint encountered would be handled in accordance with, State law and established Air Force policies, rules, and regulations.

#### No-Action Alternative

Occupational safety and health would not be impacted by the no-action alternative.



## 4.7 WATER RESOURCES

### Proposed Action

The groundwater is contaminated with chlorinated solvents. The proposed project should not impact the groundwater table; however if it does, any dewatering taking place will need to be analyzed to verify that it is not hazardous and personnel need to wear the appropriate PPE. There will be no impact of chlorinated solvents affecting the occupants the building. The drinking water from the proposed project will be provided from the base water supply system.

There will be approximately 75,000 square feet of impervious surface from the proposed project. However, approximately 50,000 square feet will be returned to a permeable surface after the demolition of the current youth center. In addition, there is 98,000 square feet of impervious surface on the proposed site. Thus proposed project will create a decrease in impervious surface and will not require any modification to the existing storm water management system. A sediment and erosion control plan will be developed and implemented during construction.

The proposed project will include restrooms that will be tied to the existing potable water and wastewater utility systems.

### No-Action Alternative

No water resources will be impacted by the no-action alternative.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

Four alternatives were evaluated with regards to this project. The no-action alternative would continue to limit youth programs and activities due to inadequate space and the substandard condition of the existing facility. This alternative was dismissed due to overcrowded conditions and a portion of the building being structurally unsound.

The second alternative was to add/alter the existing facility. This alternative was eliminated due to the condition of the existing facility and overall site issues.

The third alternative was to use other existing facilities. This alternative was eliminated due to the lack of facilities on base that could adequately support programming needs.

The fourth alternative is the proposed action to build a new, structurally sound Youth Center facility on a site where MFH units that are scheduled for demolition currently exist. The new youth center will give additional space for more computers and an area for doing homework, would allow separate study rooms, one for teens and another for younger children, and would allow separate restroom facilities for adults and children. The benefit



on the new center is primarily to meet existing demand; however, there is potential to create additional revenue through increases in membership programming and the capability to host tournament play on the base. Therefore, based on the reasons previously stated and the fact that there are no negative environmental impacts associated with the proposed action, the proposed action is the preferred action.

## **6.0 LIST OF PREPARERS**

Benner, Rayanne, 436 CES/CEV  
Contribution: Author

## **7.0 LIST OF CONTACTS**

Lavender, Gina  
436 CES/CECP  
Purpose of Contact: Proponent


Deramo, Joanne  
436 CES/CEV  
Purpose of Contact: ERP information

## **8.0 REFERENCES**

*“Dover Air Force Base, Cultural Resources Management Plan”*, October 2000  
*“Biological and Ecological Inventory of Dover Air Force Base, Delaware”*,  
November 1993

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**


AFI - Air Force Instruction  
AFOSH - Air Force Occupational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection, and Health  
AFPD - Air Force Policy Directive  
CAA - Clean Air Act  
CEQ - Council on Environmental Quality  
CFR - Code of Federal Regulations  
CWA - Clean Water Act  
CZMA – Coastal Zone Management Act  
DAFB – Dover Air Force Base  
EA - Environmental Assessment  
EIAP - Environmental Impact Analysis Process  
EIS - Environmental Impact Statement  
EO - Executive Order  
ESA - Endangered Species Act  
FAA - Federal Aviation Administration  
FONSI - Finding of No Significant Impact  
MFH - Military Family Housing  
NEPA - National Environmental Policy Act  
NHPA - National Historic Preservation Act  
NOx - Nitrogen Oxide(s)  
NRHP - National Register of Historic Places  
SHPO - State Historic Preservation Office  
SIP - State Implementation Plan  
SR - State Route  
USC - United States Code  
USACE - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
USAF - U.S. Air Force  
VOC - Volatile Organic Compound



**CURRENT AND PROPOSED ACTION LOCATIONS**  
Figure 1








PLANTS OF STATE CONCERN LOCATIONS

Figure 3



**CULTURAL RESOURCE LOCATIONS**

**Figure 4**



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
HEADQUARTERS 436TH AIRLIFT WING (AMC)

2 June 2004


MEMORANDUM FOR 436 MSG/CC

FROM: 436 AW/JA

SUBJECT: FONSI for Construction of a Youth Center Facility

1. I have reviewed the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the construction of a youth center facility. I find both documents to be in compliance with 40 CFR 1501.3 and 1508.9, as implemented by AFI 32-7061, paragraph 3.3. Additionally, the EA was made available for public review and comment and no comments were received.

2. **RECOMMENDATION:** Sign the FONSI.

  
MARC A. JONES, Maj, USAF  
Deputy Staff Judge Advocate



1st Ind, 436 AW/JA

MEMORANDUM FOR 436 MSG/CC

Concur/~~Non-concur~~

  
DONNA MARIE VERCHIO, Lt Col, USAF  
Staff Judge Advocate

# STAFF SUMMARY SHEET

	TO	ACTION	SIGNATURE (Surname), GRADE AND DATE		TO	ACTION	SIGNATURE (Surname), GRADE AND DATE
1	AW/JA	Coord	 Mike Mikula 2 May 07	6			
2	MSG/CC	Sign		7			
3	CES/CEV	Action		8			
4				9			
5				10			

SURNAME OF ACTION OFFICER AND GRADE  
Mikula, GS-13

SYMBOL  
CEV

PHONE  
6849

TYPIST'S  
INITIALS  
rb

SUSPENSE DATE

## SUBJECT

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Construction of a Multipurpose Youth Center Facility.

## DATE

20040601

## SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE. To request MSG/CC to sign the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Construction of a Multipurpose Youth Center Facility (tab 1).
2. A Request for an Environmental Impact Analysis, AF Form 813, is enclosed (tab 2).
3. An environmental assessment (EA) for the Construction of a Multipurpose Youth Center Facility (tab 3). The EA indicates there are no significant environmental impacts from the proposed action.
4. RECOMMENDATION: MSG/CC sign the enclosed FONSI.

  
M.A. PERZA  
Deputy Base Civil Engineer

- 3 Tabs
1. FONSI, for a Multipurpose Youth Center Facility
  2. AF Form 813
  3. Environmental Assessment and Supporting Documentation





DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
HEADQUARTERS 436TH AIRLIFT WING (AMC)

3 May 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR 436 MSG/CC

FROM: 436 AW/JA

SUBJECT: FONSI for Construction of a Youth Center Facility

1. I have reviewed the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the construction of a youth center facility. I find both documents to be in compliance with 40 CFR 1501.3 and 1508.9 as implemented by AFI 32-7061, paragraph 3.3.
2. RECOMMENDATION: Sign the FONSI after the public review period, allowing sufficient time after the review period to receive public comments.



GEORGE J. KONOVAL, Capt, USAF  
Chief, Environmental Law

1st Ind, 436 AW/SJA

MEMORANDUM FOR 436 MSG/CC

Concur/~~Non-concur~~



DONNA MARIE VERCHIO, Lt Col, USAF  
Staff Judge Advocate

# Delaware State

Maryland State News



State of Delaware:

County of Kent :

## PUBLIC NOTICE DOVER AIR FORCE BASE

Dover Air Force Base (DAFB) is providing a public comment period regarding an environmental assessment associated with:

- A. The Demolition of the Golf Clubhouse, Facility 827.
- B. The Demolition of 8 facilities.
- C. The Relocation of the Aircraft Outdoor Washrack.
- D. The Relocation of the Oil/Water Separator and Lift Station.
- E. The Construction of a New Youth Center Facility.

A copy of the environmental assessment is available for review at the Dover Public Library, 45 State Street, Dover, DE 19901. Comments may be submitted in writing no later than May 29, 2004 to Mr. Charles Mikula, 436 CES/CEV, 600 Chevron Avenue, Dover AFB, DE 19902-5600. All comments received prior to May 29, 2004 will be considered in the final decision. 469757 DSN 05/16-19

Before me, a Notary Public, for the County and State aforesaid, personally appeared Tamra Brittingham, known to me to be such, who being sworn according to law deposes and says that she is Publisher of the Delaware State News, a daily newspaper published at Dover, County of Kent and State of Delaware, and that the notice, a copy of which is hereto attached, was published in the Delaware State News in its issue of

May 16 & 19, 2004

*Tamra Brittingham*

Publisher

Sworn to and subscribed before me this

day of

24th  
May

A.D.

2004

*Janet E. Kelly*

Notary Public

## STAFF SUMMARY SHEET

	TO	ACTION	SIGNATURE (Surname), GRADE AND DATE		TO	ACTION	SIGNATURE (Surname), GRADE AND DATE
1	AW/JA	Coord	<i>30 May 04</i> <i>L.H. Vukobratovic</i>	6			
2	CES/CEV	Action		7			
3				8			
4				9			
5				10			

SURNAME OF ACTION OFFICER AND GRADE

Mikula, GS-13

SYMBOL

CEV

PHONE

6849

TYPIST'S

INITIALS

rb

SUSPENSE DATE

SUBJECT

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Construction of a Youth Center Facility.

DATE

20040427

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE. To request 436 AW/JA concurrence with the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Construction of a Youth Center Facility.

2. A Request for an Environmental Impact Analysis, AF Form 813, is enclosed (tab 1).

3. An EA with a FONSI is enclosed (tab 2). The EA indicates there are no significant environmental impacts from the proposed action.

4. RECOMMENDATION: 436 AW/JA concur with the EA and FONSI.

*M.A. Perza*  
M.A. PERZA  
Deputy Base Civil Engineer

2 Tabs  
1. AF Form 813  
2. EA and FONSI